



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,141	01/03/2000	RAYMOND GUZMAN	241/288	7365

22249 7590 03/28/2002

LYON & LYON LLP  
633 WEST FIFTH STREET  
SUITE 4700  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

EXAMINER

ALAM, SHAHID AL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

R

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/476,141

Applicant(s)

GUZMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Shahid Al Alam

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on January 3, 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 13, 14 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 12, 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2172

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The application has been examined. Claims 1 – 17 are pending in this application.

### ***Drawings***

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1 – 9, 11, 13, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,275,824 issued to Kenneth W. O'Flaherty et al. (hereinafter "O'Flaherty").

With respect to claim 1, O'Flaherty teaches a process for accessing a virtual table comprising:

identifying a data source (The data source may be the customer, or may be a third party intermediary source, see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1);

associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, said virtual table having a different column signature than said record (When a record is retrieved from a data view, actual record are derived from the base table to the virtual table. In order to carryout this process, the column signature of the derived table or the view does not necessarily have to be the same as the base table. See column 4, lines 13 – 27 and column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 2);

accessing said record (the data itself is stored in a persistent base table and the view's rows are derived from that base table, see column 4, lines 24 – 26); and

logically populating said virtual table with said record (SQL statements are used to pull appropriate rows to populate the result table (view) from the base table, see column 7, lines 60 - 63).

As to claim 2, said record is accessed based upon data description information for said record (data from the base table are retrieved to the view based upon content of some column, see column 8, lines 16 – 23).

As to claim 3, said data description information is located in said record (there are certain columns in the base table which contain restrictive information for each record, see column 7, lines 12 – 27).

As to claim 4, said data description information is located external to said record (the restrictive information of a certain record resides in the base table and are not shown in the views, see column 8, lines 24 – 34).

As to claim 5, said data description information is located in a second virtual record (information of certain columns in the base table are shown as a separate view than the rest of the columns, see column 8, lines 10 – 15).

As to claim 6, said data source is a database table (column 6, lines 6 – 8).

As to claim 7, said data source is an operating system file (The metadata monitoring extension 114 also records data source information, so customers can determine the source of the data stored in the secured data warehouse 102. All the data sources reside in files in computer, managed by the operating system. See column 6, lines 35 - 65).

As to claim 8, a user-defined function is used to access said virtual table (shows the data (information) that is analyzed or retrieved comes from a virtual table, see column 8, line 62 – column 9, line 1).

As to claim 9, identifying a second data source (the examiner considers Third Party APPS (112) or Business APPS (110) in Figure 10 as the second data source. The data source may be the customer or may be a third party intermediary source, see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1);

associating a second record within said second data source to a virtual table (The examiner considers Figure 3A as the second virtual table. When a record is retrieved from a data view, actual records are derived from the base table to the virtual table. see also column 4, lines 18 – 28);

accessing said second record (the data itself is stored in a persistent base table and the view's rows are derived from that base table, see column 4, lines 24 – 26); and

logically populating said virtual table with said second record (SQL statements are used to pull appropriate rows (first row or second row or any other row) to populate the result table (view) from the base table, see Figure 3 and also column 7, lines 60 - 63).

As to claim 11, said record populates a row in said virtual table, said second record populates a second row in said virtual table (in Figure 3A, examiner interprets that "Bill K. Jones" populates a row in virtual table and "Joan Peters" populate a second row in virtual table).

As to claim 13, a data manipulation operation is performed against said virtual table (while other views materialize entire tables before narrowing down the data to the view subset, TERADATA generates SQL that selectively pulls appropriate columns and rows into the result table, see column 7, lines 60 – 63).

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 14, said data manipulation operation comprises a SQL arithmetic operation (column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 3).

With respect to claim 17, O'Flaherty teaches a process for accessing a virtual table comprising:

identifying a data source (The data source may be the customer, or may be a third party intermediary source, see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1);

associating a record within said data source to a virtual table (When a record is retrieved from a data view, actual record are derived from the base table to the virtual table see column 4, lines 13 – 27 and column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 2);

accessing said record (the data itself is stored in a persistent base table and the view's rows are derived from that base table, see column 4, lines 24 – 26); and

logically populating said virtual table with said record (SQL statements are used to pull appropriate rows to populate the result table (view) from the base table, see column 7, lines 60 - 63).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 10, 12, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest in combination with other elements, wherein said record populates a row in said virtual table, said second record also populates said row as recited in claim 10,

said record comprises a first and a second column, both said first and said second columns used to populate a single column in said virtual table as recited in column 12, and

logically populating said second virtual table with said second record wherein said data manipulation operation operates against both said virtual table and said second virtual table as recited in claim 15.

Claim 16 further limit the subject matter of claim 15.



**Conclusion**

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Number 6,253,203 issued to O'Flaherty et al.: A system and method for enforcing privacy constraints on a database management system.

U.S. Patent Number 6,078,925 issued to Anderson et al.: Relational extenders to extend a database business table with new complex data types in that these new data types appear to application developers as seamless extensions to SQL.

**Contact Information**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shahid Al Alam whose telephone number is (703) 305-2358. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry related to status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Shahid Al Alam  
Examiner, Art Unit 2172  
March 23, 2002

